

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

In any science systematic observation is possible only within the framework of some explicitly stated theory. The subjects of an enquiry depend on the theory and are formulated in terms of a given theory. The data themselves only to a little extent suggest the possible topics and methods of investigation. In fact, there are no such things as complete data.

The results of any observation depend, to a certain extent, on the various instruments used as well as the observer's preconceptions, expectations and goals. The connection between data and theory is measured in terms of the level of abstraction which the theory represents.

A low-level theory may be defined as one that aims merely at classification and summary of the data, while a high-level theory is largely deductive and aims at constructing general laws for the explanation of data.

It is obvious that for the same data more than one theory are possible. They can differ among themselves in their explanatory power, their truth relation to reality (as represented by the data), the range and value of predictions and so on.

2.1 Theoretical Context

The area of linguistics that deals with how messages are translated into the form of a text is still in a state of flux. There is not yet any consensus as to the best framework in which to account for them - semantics, syntax, functionalism or sociolinguistics. The different perspectives have led, in turn, to wide variability in characterisation of the concepts involved, the difficulty arising from the fact that "elusive internal states" are involved - ideas about "how to structure discourse", "stage utterances, foreground and background information ..." and in general, "describe psychological structures and mental states that are not well understood" (Bates and MacWhinney, 1982:198).

2.2 Halliday's Model

The theoretical framework that I have chosen for this study is what Halliday would call the

Sentence out

'grammar of messages' by which is meant the grammar which specifies the choices that speakers/writers make in introducing structures into discourse - choices which represent the ultimate and essential means by which the pieces of language are organised into text.

Many proposals have been advanced - semantic, syntactic, functional, sociolinguistic - to account for the process by which these choices are made. The choices in question become particularly evident in the process of translation, which is concerned with capturing all the meaningful components of the text as a whole, a step which is necessary in order to be able to re-create a fully meaningful text in the target language.

Text depends for its realization as much on the reader as it does on the writer. When speakers assume that what they hear and read is text, that is, communication is taking place, this assumption for Halliday is a functional one, for it rests "... on recognising the role that language is playing in the situation". The primary hypothesis here is that the Halliday model has cross language validity.

In order to understand the approach that Halliday

takes, it is important to have in mind the principles that form his work.

Much of the Halliday model has as its origins the London School and its leader, J.R. Firth. Halliday has also broadened his Firthian background with insights from other schools and trends in linguistics, including the Prague school of functionalism with their functional sentence perspective. Some authors, in fact, consider him a neo-Firthian. (Monaghan, 1979)

For both Firth and Halliday, language at all levels, from phonology to discourse, is systemic - moreover polysystemic, since there are a number of systems available for the speaker to draw on, consciously or unconsciously, in formulating a given utterance. Halliday uses **system** to mean

"a set of options in a stated environment; in other words, a choice together with a condition of entry"

(Halliday, 1974:45)

which refers to the configuration of elements that must be present elsewhere in the structure for a speaker to exercise his option. The systems are interrelated. A given linguistic item may have value in a number of systems simultaneously. A system will come into play depending on the options that the speaker has chosen in

other systems. It is by speakers exercising different options that the corresponding values are combined.

System or **systemic** in the Firthian sense refer to relations on the paradigmatic axis while **Structure**, **structural** refer to relations on the syntagmatic axis. On the syntagmatic axis, linguistic elements are considered to have function by virtue of the places in which they occur. Syntagmatic relations were originally characterised by Saussure as those pertaining to elements "arranged in sequence on the chain of speaking" (Saussure, 1915 [1959]:123). In Firthian linguistics, on the paradigmatic axis, linguistic items, or terms, give values to the elements of structure by commuting within systems (Firth, 1957:306); their values are derived from the contrasts that they show with other items that could occur in the same position.

In terms of the purpose that a given system serves in communication, that is, its function, a linguistic item is said to have a 'value' and this value is considered by the London School to be **semantic**. Firth, and later Halliday, took it that the options exercised by speakers, no matter what the system, have semantic correlates.

No discussion of functionalism is complete without a word on its counterpart, mentalism. In American

linguistics, mentalism is thought of most frequently in contrast to mechanism or behaviorism. As a reaction to the behaviorism introduced by Bloomfield (1933), according to which only observable events were admitted as scientific evidence. In the 1950's, the pendulum began to swing towards a linguistic theory that would recognise introspection as a valid source of knowledge. The move had a big push from Noam Chomsky of course. One of the main underlying differences between the two approaches is that in behaviorism the speech act is considered a response to external stimuli - either those of the immediate speech situation or previous stimuli which eventually lead to habits (Bloomfield, 1933:29-32) - whereas in mentalism language is regarded as the product of human faculties; and speech is explained as an effect of the thoughts (intentions, beliefs, feeling) of the speaking subject.

Mentalism contrasts not only with behaviorism but also with functionalism. The sense of contrast, however, is not exactly the same. Functionalism as it is used by Halliday does not entirely leave out the notion of inherent linguistic competence. The speaker, when he is exercising his options, is drawing upon systems that are within his competence in order to respond to cues he

receives from the situation. The thoughts begin with the speaker, and many choices are made in terms of his intentions, feelings and beliefs. ✓

At the same time, language is seen as the principal resource that is available to people for dealing with the situations in which they find themselves in society, and it is from meeting these purposes that, many of its functions are derived. And if communication is to take place, the speaker and the listener must engage in cooperative effort (Grice, 1975: 45). The speaker must gain the listener's attention and enlist his powers of comprehension; the speaker's intentions must be clear and comprehensible to the listener. The functionalists studied what speakers/listeners can do with language. The mentalists, on the other hand, study what the speaker/listener knows (Leech, 1980:16).

2.3 The Role Of Cohesion In Texture Of Discourse

Halliday had long been concerned with what he calls,

"the principal options whereby the speaker introduces structures into the discourse and ensures 'comprehension' - the recognition of text as text, and its interpretation along predicted lines".

(Halliday, 1968:179)

Speakers must necessarily exercise these options if they are to create text, but the manner in which they are exercised is highly variable and open to the speakers' discretion.

According to Martin Phillips, 'text' denotes the purely formal aspects of the suprasentential organisation of language but he also believes there is one ultimate fact about text,

"it consists of elements of linguistic substance juxtaposed in linear sequence. (and) In the case of written text, the skilled reader somehow internalises from the encounter with graphic substance a model of some aspect of 'reality'. This is what constitutes the meaning of the text".

(Martin Phillips, 1994:3)

There is one common thread which runs through the various approaches to text. They all make certain assumptions about the relationship obtaining between text and the non-linguistic world. Text is held to stand in a describable relation to 'reality'. The Firthian tradition, for example, is concerned with the connection between text and its

social context while Saussure's concept of the linguistic sign is a relational one, bringing into association a signifier and what is signified.

Halliday, a product of the London School, inherited from Firth, who was in turn influenced by Malinowski, the understanding that language derives its meaning from the function it serves in the context of the speech by virtue of the context in which an utterance is made, that is, the context of situation.

"A statement, spoken in real life, is never detached from the situation in which it has been uttered ... Utterances and situation are bound up inextricably with each other and the context of situation is indispensable for the understanding of the words. Exactly as in the reality of spoken or written languages, a word without linguistic context is a mere figment and stands for nothing by itself, so in the reality of a spoken living tongue, the utterance has no meaning except in the context of situation".

(Halliday, 1923 [1953]:306)

From Malinowski - who acknowledges a debt to Wegener (1885) - comes the idea that language in use is what gives it its meaning. Language is to be understood in terms of its functions in a given culture. Moreover, language in general serves more than one purpose: it is multifunctional. Malinowski actually identified four

functions of language: pragmatic, narrative, magical and phatic.

In the Firthian view of language, meaning is not restricted to an autonomous level but is considered to underlie the entire broad range of purposes for which language is employed.

Still working within the broad perspective originally established by Malinowski, Halliday considers that the meaning which is associated with the speaker's choice within a given situational context is derived from the function which that choice performs in communication. So important is the notion of function to Halliday that he equates functional theory with the theory of language itself (1974:46). The exercise of options from different but interrelated systems serves to "link together the different functions which language is required to fulfil" (Halliday, 1968:207). "Language is as it is because of the functions it has evolved to serve" (1974:45).

There is thus the assumption that reality is a given and that through the system of language it is encapsulated in text. Text is seen as a mirror of reality, perhaps a distorting one at times, but all the same, doing no more than reflecting something which

exists outside language. Text is a form of linguistic organisation which allows 'content' to be embodied in language.

According to Halliday and Hasan, the set of resources that are available in a language to express the property of "being a text" (1976:2) is "texture". Their notion of texture parallels interpretations elsewhere of **coherence**, for example, Frederiksen's (1977:314). The latter interprets coherence as "the property that makes a discourse more than a collection of unrelated simple sentences".

Widdowson (1977) on his part, sees coherence as the property or properties within a text that make possible "a dynamic process of meaning creation" leading to the formation of a meaningful piece of discourse. Cohesion is a property of the text, but coherence is a property of the reader's interaction with the text. In other words,

"cohesion is the objective quality of a text while coherence is a subjective judgement on text, which must in some way take account of the nature of the cohesion present".

(Hoey, 1991)

In their work, Hasan, Winter, and Phillips implied that cohesion does contribute to coherence, is

directly relevant to the interpretation of pairs of sentences and does produce a form of text organisation.

Indeed, the concept of coherence is very complex with many intertwining threads, one of which is **cohesion**. Halliday and Hasan (1985) imply that cohesion is an essential feature of a text if it is judged to be coherent when they say,

"cohesion is the foundation upon which the edifice of coherence is built. If the foundation is not present the edifice cannot be built".

(Halliday & Hasan, 1985:94)

For Halliday and Hasan, texture is made up of three types of resources: cohesion, thematic organisation, and discourse structure. **Cohesion** refers to the relations of meaning within a text that define it as a text (1975:4). These relations constitute explicit links, or ties, between an earlier element and a subsequent element which are relevant to interpretation of the latter. They are of the following types: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Cohesion and thematic organisation, taken together, constitute the microstructure.

The discourse structure is the macrostructure, the larger structure that is the property of the forms of discourse themselves. In fact, it is this

concept of the high-level organisation of a text that led to the growth of the field of enquiry known as text linguistics in the seventies. This was emphasised, for example by van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) and by van Dijk alone (1985). It is assumed that every genre has its own discourse structure. And it is this structure which differentiates one type of discourse from another; that makes a maintenance manual distinct from a scientific thesis. Different kinds of content in discourse map to different surface grammatical patterns, each in its own way.

2.4 Contrastive Text Analysis

The present study undertakes to find out via translated discourse the extent Malay and English differ in terms of formal devices deployed and manipulated by contextual factors to bring about a flow of information through a linguistic sequence.

Translation in this thesis, is interpreted as the deconstructing of a source text and its reconstructing into the target text, that is, form manipulation (in the target text) with reference to content (manifested in the linguistic signs of the source text). It is the interpretation in another set of linguistic systems, of the signals that were the

components of the original message and their relative importance.

Based on these assumptions there is no doubt that the approach most suitable for this purpose is contrastive text analysis. Such an approach impinges, of course, upon the area of text analysis or text linguistics as the European linguists, such as W.U Dressler, de Beaugrande, van Dijk, termed it.

Among others to attempt a linguistic type of analysis of connecting discourse or text have been the American structuralist Charles Fries (1952), the first American transformationalist Zellig Harris (1960), and the tagmemicists Kenneth Pike and Robert Longacre (1968, 1972).

One of the most promising approaches to text analysis is the one taken by de Beaugrande (1980; de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981) which draws heavily on a view of text as communicative interaction.

According to de Beaugrande texts cannot be studied via a mere extension of linguistic methodology to the domain of texts. Rather, in order to understand texts they must be studied as they function in human interaction. The central notion of de Beaugrande 's work is that, **textuality**, that which makes a text a unified,

meaningful whole rather than just a string of unrelated words and sentences, lies not in the text per se as some independent artifactual object of study, but rather in the social and psychological activities human beings perform with it.

2.4.1 Text Linguistics

More recently the properties of texts have been examined in terms of the linguistic property of cohesion. This is evident even in studies focussing on genre conducted by structurally-oriented text linguists such as Martin (1985), Swales (1985), and Ventola (1987), where the 'structural' description derives as much from the context in which the text is used as from the internal features of the text itself. ✓

Text linguistics is not a very precise term, as it is used across the wide-ranging literature on the subject. The term dates from the 70's, when it became current among a group of German linguists working at Munster, Cologne, and Bielefield.

Text linguistics is by definition concerned with texts. In present-day literature the term refers to practically any analysis of text, as long as the primary interest is in relationships beyond the

sentence. This means that text linguistics covers concern that used to be shared out between grammar, stylistics, and rhetoric - headings that have been used since classical times for the study of language.

A distinction is often made between text linguistics, discourse analysis, discourse linguistics, and conversation analysis. Generally speaking by text linguistics is meant the study of linguistic devices of cohesion and coherence within a text.

2.4.2 Discourse And Conversation Analysis

Discourse analysis and conversation analysis on the other hand, imply looking at texts in their interactional and communicative moves between speakers in face-to-face communication. The distinction between these two terms is more traditional rather than substantial. Discourse analysis is a term particularly popular in Britain. Suggestions have in fact been made, though not very successfully to use discourse linguistics as a superordinate cover term for text linguistics together with discourse and conversation analysis.

2.5 Early Analytical Studies On Cohesion

Early attempts to undertake analysis of cohesion over stretches of language consisting of more than a few sentences were made by linguistic researchers such as Gutwinski (1969). Gutwinski examined the use of a wide range of cohesive devices in several literary English texts basing his categorization of cohesive devices on work by Halliday (1962) which distinguishes grammatical and lexical devices. In his studies Gutwinski attempted to root cohesion in a stratificational framework; its focus on the potential stylistic applications of cohesive studies has provided a starting point for some research studies in stylistics.

Zellig Harris (1952) could in fact, be cited as one of the earliest to make incursions into the study of text analysis.

His preface to the Phoenix edition of Structural Linguistics (1960) contains two important additions to the distributional method, which mark the end of classical structuralism.

First he proposed to describe a language by means of a set of kernel sentences and transformations operating on these kernel sentences,

thereby yielding the sentences of the language. (cf. Harris [1969]:vi-vii). With the aid of these tools, subtle syntactic and semantic relations between sentences could be described and ambiguities explained (cf. Harris [1968]:49-157).

Another point of his was to stress that linguistic analysis earlier had not gone beyond the limits of the sentence and that the methods known had not allowed the description of the structural relations between sentences or parts of different sentences. The tools necessary for describing connected pieces of writing or talking were provided by discourse analysis which Harris had suggested in two works in 1952. The only generally known discussion of Harris' discourse analysis is in Bierwisch (1965), reprinted in Bierwisch (1971).

Bierwisch, in his discussion was not prepared to accept Harris' proposals, because he thought the notion of discourse was not explicated within his theory. The structural methods used were not appropriate for the objects chosen and yielded ad hoc results.

Bierswisch's alternative consisted in demanding from a text theory to explicate the notion of 'text in

L' in analogy to Chomsky's 'sentence in L' and to determine what constituted the connection between the sentences of a discourse.

Thus Bierwisch was among the first to formulate what was later known as the **coherence problem** or coherence principle in the literature even though he did not put forward any suggestion of his own on this subject.

The only attempt to use structuralist methods in a narrow sense occurred in Harweg (1968). He concentrated on text coherence, more specifically on substitution by 'pro-forms'.

'Pro-forms' or 'pro-words' (CHAPTER FOUR p.107) as they are sometimes called, stood for expressions of identical or different morphological form designating the same object and replacing each other in texts in certain conditions.

It is interesting to note that despite the purely syntactic approach used by Harris as well as Harweg, the justification for these substitution procedures was essentially of a semantic nature. As to Harweg's proposals, it remained unclear how his pro-form related to other means of creating text coherence, such as tense and time reference. Harweg's

approach resulted in an 'open' taxonomy of pro-forms, and these pro-forms could be used to connect sentences. Harweg's approach consisted in a pure classification procedure which was duly criticized even by linguist working in the field of descriptive linguistics.

Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that Harweg has made valuable contribution to research into the mechanisms of text structure. There is still no theory accounting for the facts discovered by him. Of course the same objection could be made to Harweg's ideas as to Harris' discourse analysis. They do not allow an intuitively adequate decision on whether a particular utterance can be regarded as a text or not, nor do they explain what properties a piece of natural language must have to constitute a text. ✓

Contrastive text linguistics had a good start with Gleason (1968). Gleason examined the semological structure of discourse considering the notion of a sequence of actions and participant roles. At the same time he considered the use of some cohesive devices such as anaphoric and lexical repetition, relating them to the description of and reference to participants in discourse. Later, particularly Hinds (1972) worked on contrastive text grammar (of Japanese and English, A.

Kawashima for Japanese and German). Dressler (1974) was of the opinion that such studies can be used for the practice, criticism and teaching of translation.

2.6 Contrastive Analysis

Contrastive analysis (CA) is defined generally as a method which enables the differences and similarities between languages to be stated explicitly, though the term 'contrastive' implies that the interest is more on the differences between languages than in their likenesses. Its task can be approached in many different ways depending upon the theory of language to which the investigator adheres. The results of investigations will differ to a considerable extent because the task itself, especially the terms 'difference' and 'similarity' will be understood differently in two different theories. For example, the structural linguist will apply these terms to the surface phenomena such as sentence structure, modification structures and the like. The analyst more prone to the transformational theory of language will compare rules which relate the common deep structure to two different surface structures rather than compare directly the surface elements of the two languages.

2.7 Classical Contrastive Analysis


Apart from the divergences resulting from opposite methodological approaches to language and reflected in different formulations of the immediate goals of the analysis, differences can also be found in the philosophical assumptions underlying each school. These differences will influence the final goal of the investigations. Structuralists will expectedly emphasise the differences among languages while transformationalists will look for the evidence that languages are, after all 'cut to the same pattern'. The search for universal linguistic features is the primary objective of transformational grammar.

Classical contrastive analyses of all sorts proved to be incapable of grasping certain important generalizations concerning differences between the compared languages. Classical contrastive analysis mean such analyses in which the contrasting procedures have no generative grammars of the compared languages, that is, such grammars which are both explicit and predictive.

Classical contrastive analyses are taxonomic in nature since they are limited to yielding inventories of

differences and possible similarities between parallel systems of the compared grammatical structures, between equivalent sentences and constructions and between equivalent rules operating at various levels of derivations. All classical contrastive analyses are based on sentence grammars, that is, on grammars which are defined by sentence rather than longer stretches of the text.

The necessity of conducting contrastive analyses (CA) for pedagogical purposes has long been recognised and a host of valuable works, both theoretical and practical has been published (cf. a survey of research in Nickel 1971). CA no longer claimed as much pedagogic attention although the 70's saw the establishment of major contrastive linguistic projects especially between English and other European languages; German, Polish and Serbo-Croat. Through the major contrastive projects, it has been recognised that CA can provide valuable insights, pertinent not only to the teaching of languages being contrasted, the description of particular language typology but also machine translation, language typology and the study of language universals.



In the seventies, there was a substantial growth in interest in analysis of texts of various types. To a large extent emphasis was given to the analysis of spoken text though subsequently and in the eighties especially, attention turned to the analysis of written text (de Beaugrande, 1980, 1984; de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981; van Dijk, 1985; van Dijk and Kintsch, 1978, 1983; Dressler, 1978; Grimes, 1975; Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Much of the work undertaken has, in fact, been concerned with theory; but some effort has been made not only to permit access to teachers but also to translate theory into practice, in the form of materials available to teachers of L1 and L2 writing (Bander, 1980; Kaplan and Shaw, 1983; Raimes, 1977; Winterowd, 1980, 1983).

2.8 Relevance To Translation

As stated in the introduction to CHAPTER ONE, one of the most important developments in the theory of translation in the last decade or so has been the gradual shift of focus from interlingual to intertextual relationships. This is what in fact distinguishes translation from contrastive studies.

As interlingual textual equivalents of existing texts, translations are characterised by always

having a unique or privileged intertextual relationship with another text in another language. It is, in fact, the interdisciplinary demand for theories and models that has been a major impetus in the development of text linguistics, the general feeling being that language study should do more than describe the structures of sentences and be concerned with the processes by which language is utilised by human beings.

The more traditional approaches to contrastive linguistics were essentially oriented towards the establishment of static systemic contrasts of grammatical, lexical and phonological elements.

Whilst useful in providing a deeper insight into the linguistic systems under treatment, they were inadequate for any explanatory description of units larger than a sentence.

The history of contrastive analysis implies that cross-linguistic analysis based on a static view of language is insufficient. The older preoccupation with demonstration sentences isolated from communicative contexts is being replaced by a new concern for the naturally occurring manifestation of language: the TEXT. Language occurrences may have the surface

format of single words or sentences, but they occur as texts: meaningful configurations(s) of language that is intended to communicate (de Beaugrande, 1982).

This shift in investigation to the text is significant in two directions, namely, a move from the exploration of shorter toward longer samples of language and, the replacement of an emphasis on abstract forms by an interest in the utilisation processes of language.

Traditional contrastive analysis was primarily a decontextualised study of static, structural contrasts of certain sub-systems of two languages (the study of 'langue' [de Saussure] or 'usage' [Widdowson]).

Contrastive analysis of translated discourse on the other hand is largely an investigation of 'stylistic' variability on the expression plane in two languages. Special reference is made to constituent features of the communication situation (that is, "parole" [de Saussure] or "use" [Widdowson] oriented study).

This kind of contrastive study lends itself easily as a base for applied translation science because the primary objective of translation procedures

is to find "the most natural equivalence" (Nida, 1969) in the target language for the content and function of a source language.

As there are normally several 'nearly' equivalent modes of expression in the target language for a given translation unit of the source language, the alternatives are not contrasting elements (as they are in the purely static structural approach to contrastive analysis) but variants.

Optional transformations operate in language and provide it with a repertoire of referentially identical but textually different variants for the writer or speaker to select from and ensure that the communicative dynamism is effectively and economically maintained in the text.

These optional transformations often referred to as 'stylistic' transformations or what Kaplan (1966) terms "the rhetorical structure of languages" influence the process of reconstruction in a translation and help to create or support text coherence, and in so doing provide it with the so-called "property of texture" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Hasan, 1971).

Kaplan's notion was that speakers of different languages use different devices to present information, to establish relationships among ideas, to show the centrality of one idea as opposed to another, to select the most effective means of presentation.

While every language has at its disposal a set of devices for maintaining textual cohesion (such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical organisation), each language has certain preferences so that while all forms are possible, all forms do not occur with equal frequency or in parallel distribution.

A special kind of cohesion system is found in the linkage patterns of many languages where a portion of text is repeated to give a starting point for what follows.

A rather extreme case of linkage encountered is that of the Kayapo of Brazil (Stout and Thompson, 1971) in which an entire paragraph is repeated nearly verbatim as a lead into a paragraph that describes a new course of events. In most other languages a single clause is repeated or paraphrased as a link, or a conventional consequence is given.

Ellipsis may be a mark of 'good style' for English, but the exact opposite holds for other languages. In the marking of logical connections between sentences the contrast between pairs of languages is very obvious.

Malay and English are quite different in the way linkage between sentences is brought about. In Malay, instead of conjunctions, one finds constructions in which part of each preceding sentence is repeated in a grammatically different form in order to maintain cohesion. It is a fact that basically Malay (particularly spoken Malay) is paratactic rather than hypotactic, that is, one would normally prefer to say,

She was frightened (and) she screamed.

simply juxtaposing the two ideas rather than use a conjunction to make a causal connection between ideas and say,

She screamed because she was frightened.

Indeed 'antithesis', marked by the balanced juxtaposition of words and clauses, is fundamental to Malay syntax and style as emphasised by Winstedt (Winstedt, 1927:148) and modern Malay linguists like

Asmah Haji Omar (1987, 1991, 1993) Awang Sariyan (1984) and others. Balance is an elementary principle in Malay with its lack of a copula and its infrequent use of conjunctive words.

Malay literary style has oft^e_n been criticised for what are termed tedious repetitions and trailing redundancies which in fact are stylistic features that make for lucidity and emphasis.

It is this writer's observation however, that this same style does not hold true for modern academic Malay which shows strong resemblances to English syntactic structures and style.

English on the other hand, is marked by a kind of redundancy at the sentential and intersentential levels. However, the fact that English style should be so marked does not suggest that the styles of expository prose in other languages should be so marked.

Indeed investigations in a number of other languages and dialects - the Spanish of Puerto Rico, the French of Eastern Canada, the Arabic of Cairo, Mandarin of Taiwan - suggest that the expository characteristics of those languages are quite different.

Besides, any native speaker of any particular language has at his disposal hundreds of different mechanisms to signify the same meaning. Variations exist but they are marked for sociolinguistic constraints, for written versus oral usage, and for a number of other features. The native speaker can choose among them, presumably recognising the various pertinent constraints.

A number of studies over the past decade has touched on the English rhetoric of non-English speakers and the rhetoric of other languages. Kaplan's study of rhetoric in contrastive situations, examined not only what non-English speakers do when they try to write in English, but also - though to a more limited extent - what speakers of other languages do when they write in their mother tongues.

It is significant that the emergence of translation as a subject worthy of serious academic study coincided with the rise of textlinguistics in the 70's. In translation we are basically concerned with the text, not as a chain of separate sentences, each of these a string of grammatical and lexical items in itself, but as a complex structured whole, whereby coherence, cohesion, focus and progression are of primary importance.

The rules of textual cohesion and progression vary from one language to another, both within the sentence and beyond the sentence boundary. A text may be defined as any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length which forms a unified whole. A text is not just a random sequence of content-related sentences: the sentences appear in a fixed order, and, over and above this, there are formal devices which signal the exact nature of the relationships holding between successive sentences. These devices may be grammatical, lexical or, in speech, intonational.

It is my hypothesis that while the relationships that can obtain between sentences are universals, the formal devices which signal the exact nature of the relationships holding between successive sentences differ from language to language. The present study undertakes to find out how different are pairs of languages in terms of their textual conventions, more specifically, to what extent Malay and English differ in terms of these formal devices which are deployed and manipulated by contextual factors to bring about a flow of information through a linguistic sequence.

"Empirical studies on cohesion in written English indicate that judgements of writing quality may depend on overall coherence in content, organisation and style rather than on the quantity of cohesion".

(Patricia Johnson, 1992)

The different forms of sentence occurring in texts are motivated in a large part by the unfolding patterns of information proceeding through the discourse. Sentences in sequence normally exhibit a variety of different structures. Hence treating a text as nothing but a collection of individual sentences does not do justice to a text's structural complexity. /

Apart from the fact that the sentences taken in isolation from their surrounding text will often be highly ambiguous, and sometimes practically meaningless, much of the message itself can only be understood when seen as a single structure. No simple summing up of the meaning of the separate sentences (if at all possible) can capture a significant part of the message which the text was intended to convey.

Text understanding involves complex linguistic processes on many levels. The sentences a text is composed of must not only be analysed internally (that is, as self-contained units) but also as

functional elements in the larger unit of the text.

Many words in many sentences can only be understood when seen as markers of textual functions, or influenced by such functions of cohesion and coherence. Syntactic variation (passive/active, nominalization of verbs etc.) is not just free variation, but more often than not, fulfils a definite textual function. Consequently the function of a given syntactic variant only becomes understandable if we look at its job within the discourse.

The relationship between cohesion and coherence in a text has been an interesting question to researchers and language teachers. Scholars of written discourse (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Grimes, 1977; Dijk, 1977; Beaugrande, 1980) have all made theoretical distinctions between cohesion and coherence. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) in fact kept the two concepts entirely separate by listing them as two of the seven standards that a text must meet if it is to be regarded as communicative.

According to Halliday and Hasan's explanation of the concept of text (1976:18-28), coherence is dependent on the cohesion within the text and the context of situation. Cohesion within the text

concerns the inter-sentence relationships in the language, which are realized by the writer's choice of syntactic and semantic elements. The "context of situation" refers to external factors which influence the writer's choice of language. These external factors may be the topic as well as the writer's perception of the potential reader of the text. Likewise, the coherence of a text for a reader depends on the perception of situational and linguistic cues chosen by the reader.

However, Halliday and Hasan (1976:18-28) point out that a writer can construct a passage which is **coherent** in a situational and semantic sense for a reader, but lacks the intersentence cohesion. Widdowson (1978) shares the same view in noting that it is quite possible to encounter snatches of dialogue that manifests no instance of cohesive tie but which are entirely coherent in spite of that. By the same token, a writer can construct a cohesive passage which lacks continuity of meaning in situation and topic for a reader. Those readers who are not able to find an interpretation, either in the intersentence cohesive cues or in the situational elements unconsciously construct a "context of situation" for

To Hoey (1991:106) cohesion is a property of the text, but coherence is a property of the reader's interaction with the text.

Coherence in discourse may also reflect crosscultural differences in rhetorical forms. With reference to expository writing, Kaplan states:

"each language and each culture has a paragraph order unique to itself, and part of the learning of a particular language is the mastering of its logical system".

(Kaplan, 1966:256)

Subsequent crosscultural studies in rhetoric have indicated that the internal logic and organization of a text may differ considerably across languages. Thus, rhetorical patterns seem to be determined by both the language and the culture.

Much of the current research in contrastive rhetoric is centered on English compositions written by different groups of second-language students. While such an approach offers many insights (Kaplan, 1966; 1982) contrastive rhetoric must include comparisons of edited texts in different languages, where the writing is somehow comparable (Hinds, 1980; 1983a; 1984).

This research study is a step in that direction, as it is an attempt to compare texts in the source language, English with their translations in another language which is Malay.

Translating one natural language into another can be seen as a form of analysis: explaining an utterance's meaning by rephrasing it in another language, or as Peter Newmark (1981:23) puts it, "a translation is the only direct statement of linguistic meaning". Most people seem to agree that a considerable amount of surface processing (syntactic manipulation) is necessary to carry out such a task.

Texts and many of their elements are linguistic signs of form and content. The objective of translation is to replace the form and to preserve the content of the text. Translation is thus form manipulation with reference to content.

The proposal in this study is that translation can be used to advantage for the purpose of cross-language comparisons.

Unlike natural speech and writing which are processes that generate language, translation is interpretative in essence, it is an interpretation in

another set of linguistic systems, of the signals that were the components of the original message and of their relative importance.

Becker (1984) emphasises that translation is a "necessary first step in understanding a text". He considers that the source of constraints on text is context, and that translation helps to show the ways in which the context constrains a particular language.

Indeed translation can be used as an approach in its own right for the elucidation of contextual relations. Translation and discourse cannot be separated and that's a fact (Catford, 1965; Mounin, 1970; Nida and Taber, 1974; Enkvist, 1976; Delisle, 1980). Translation can serve as an independent tool for verifying whether or not the meaning-values of discourse relations are typically captured by translators as part of the import of a message.

2.9 Text And Discourse

It is pertinent at this juncture to have a closer look at the two terms 'text' and 'discourse'. Are they complementary approaches to a common problem or

are they two entirely different areas of linguistic concern?

Some people have an intuition that there is a difference between 'discourse' and 'text'. However, as technical terms they very often turn out to be synonymous. Lyons (1981), for example, calls everything that is uttered, 'text' while others would probably use the term 'discourse'.

Generally it is felt that if we talk about something deliberately constructed as a unit, the term 'text' is more appropriate. However, intuitions about textual well-formedness generally coincide with those about discourse well-formedness and both crucially involve and appeal to contextual assumptions. Beyond that, it seems to depend largely on whether one talks about discourse or text analysis. Here too confusion exists. Some have suggested that text analysis refers to the European traditions for doing the same thing.

Another approach is to see them as complementary, discourse analysis starting with the outer frame of situations and working inwards to find the formal linguistic correlates to the situational variables, while text analysis starts from within the

linguistic patterns of the message and asks how they may be used in certain contexts.

Investigators interested in literature usually see themselves as text linguists, whereas those coming from the field of ethnography, oral communication and cognitive science talk about 'discourse analysis'.

Brown and Yule (1983) reserves the term 'text' for the 'explicit' or 'recorded part' of discourse while 'discourse' is a general term to refer to all acts of verbal communication, so that discourse analysis and conversational analysis imply looking at texts in their interactional and situational context, including reference to the interchanges and communicative moves between speakers in face-to-face communication. The distinction between these two terms seems to be traditional rather than substantial, discourse analysis being a term particularly popular in Britain.

Thus text is a purely linguistic formal object, whereas discourse has both linguistic and non-linguistic properties. Text, in recent years has come to be used more or less exclusively for the abstract,

underlying form of a connected sequence - that which a grammar is concerned with.

In this study we shall view text analysis as concerned with the formal devices used for establishing inter-sentential connections and units larger than the sentence, that is, the linguistic devices of cohesion and coherence within a text.

2.10 Highlights Of The Halliday Model

Halliday's model has three main dimensions which contribute to the realisation of a clause in English, namely, the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual. The ideational dimension includes the sets of choices that relate to cognitive experiences, the representation of processes and relations, and persons, things and abstract concepts that participate in these processes and relations. The inter-personal, involves those options which specify the stance of the speaker in the speech situation. The textual dimension encompasses the choices that the speaker/writer makes which assign status to the elements in the clause -

"not as participants in extralinguistic processes but as components of a message; with the relation of what is being said to what has gone before in the discourse, and its internal organisation into an act of communication".

(Halliday, 1967:199)

The three dimensions of the grammar, though specified as three separate dimensions, are simultaneous and compatible in the clause and their systems are all closely inter-related.

The present study is concerned with the third dimension of the model, that is the textual dimension, the resources (in Malay and English) which enable the different bits of information in a text to be tied up to form one unified whole. For Halliday and Hasan, the organisation of text (which they term 'texture') is made up (in large part) of relationships amongst items in the text, some semantic, some grammatical, which they refer to as 'cohesive ties'.

Cohesive ties are categorised into two basic types: lexical and grammatical, which are further subdivided according to a heterogeneous group of criteria, into five broad classes, namely conjunction, reference, substitution, ellipsis and

lexical cohesion. However, the boundaries between classes of ties are admittedly quite fuzzy.

2.11 Grammatical Cohesive Devices

Halliday and Hasan identified four types of grammatical cohesion: conjunction, substitution, ellipsis, reference which is also known as co-reference. In text analysis these elements have been compared to "signposts on a road or map reference points" indicating to the reader "where he is going in relation to where he came from" (R. Williams in J. Kenworthy, 1991:100).

2.11.1 Conjunction

Conjunction stands on its own as a category, and covers the use of adjunct-like elements by writers or speakers to mark the semantic relationships they perceive as holding between the sentences they produce. Thus, items such as **however**, **alternatively**, and **on the other hand** may all serve to mark a perceived semantic relation. Conjunctions contribute to the semantic organization of a text and is part of a larger system of semantic relations between clauses. Conjunctions known as additives signal an addition to a previous element; others indicate a causal or temporal

kind of link and yet others signal a change of direction in the development of text. Halliday and Hasan term the last mentioned an adversative cohesive tie. Examples of adversative markers in English are:

yet	although
but	nevertheless
instead	on the contrary

Their counterparts in Malay are:

walaupun	sebaliknya
tetapi	walaupun bagaimanapun
selain	namun demikian

2.11.2 Reference

Reference is a semantic relation. It occurs whenever an item indicates that the identity of what is being talked about can be retrieved from the immediate context. A reference can be anaphoric when the reference is a backward-looking one or cataphoric when the reference is forward-looking. Pronouns and determiners are both, in these terms, reference items. An example of these items can be seen in the following extract. The pronouns are in bold type-face, the determiner is underlined:

It is impossible to discuss the uptake and transport of water without first considering the way **it** is lost from the leaves. In fact the latter process is an integral part of the mechanism by which **it** is drawn up the stem from the roots.

Deictic items such as, **this, these, those** and words like **such, likewise, same** are also used to tie a text together through co-reference, but by far the most common referential device is the use of pronouns.

Pronouns as a cohesive device of discourse do not function in the same way from language to language. It is quite common in English to introduce a new participant with a noun phrase and then refer to this participant by a pronoun throughout the rest of the paragraph. In fact, the pronoun is used to show that this particular participant is the topic of the entire paragraph.

There are some languages where the cohesion of participant reference is simply handled by having no overt subject in the clauses which follow, once the participant has been mentioned. In other words the lack of an overt marker adds the cohesion.

Even though the noun may be used for back reference in English, often either the article or some

modification will need to be used with the noun. A good example is

'a dog'

'the dog'

'that dog'

(Longacre, 1974)

Not all languages have articles, and even those which do may not use them in the same way. Different devices will need to be used to add the cohesion which is indicated by the English 'a dog', 'the dog' and 'that dog'.

Back reference which has to do with time or location often includes deictic pronouns as in 'at that time' and 'in that place'. Any and all kinds of back reference add cohesion to the text.

In some languages, lack of overt back reference linkage produce cohesion, since it is understood that there is unity until a new time, a new location or a new participant is introduced.

Tidaklah mungkin untuk membicarakan penyerapan dan pengangkutan air tanpa terlebih dahulu mempertimbangkan cara air itu hilang dari daun. Sebenarnya proses kehilangan air merupakan bahagian integral daripada mekanisme penyedutan air dari akar ke batang.

However it is important to note that pronouns are not always simple substitutes where the reader works backwards to an 'original' noun or noun phrase or forwards to an anticipated noun or noun phrase. Sometimes the referent is not mentioned explicitly but is implied. Also in a text that involves an object or objects that undergo changes then it is clear that pronouns cannot be seen as simply substitutions for the original noun or noun phrase.

2.11.3 Substitution And Ellipsis

Substitution and ellipsis are, according to Halliday and Hasan, grammatical relations. Substitution occurs whenever one of a small class of items 'stands in for' an earlier lexical item in the text. In English there are five items which commonly substitute for nouns (and noun phrases), verbs (and verb phrases) and clauses. They are:

one(s) the same do/did so not

Ellipsis is 'substitution by zero' - a bit of the structure of a sentence is omitted and can only be recovered from what has gone before. Ellipsis thus occurs when what stands for the earlier item is nothing at all. As Halliday and Hasan readily admit,

the boundary lines among these two categories and references are indistinct. Thus in answer to the question 'Does Mary like chocolates?' We can have three different answers, each representing a different class of cohesive tie:

- a) No, but I do.
- b) Yes, she does.
- c) Yes, she likes it very much.

2.11.4 Lexical Cohesion

Besides grammatical cohesion, expressed by such means as mentioned in 2.11.1 - 2.11.3, there is also a condition on well-formedness of a text from the lexical point of view - lexical cohesion. Under this heading Halliday and Hasan include a variety of semantic relationship that can exist between lexical items, clustering them into two broad sub-classes: reiteration and collocation.

Reiteration covers a wide range of ways in which one lexical item may be understood to conjure up the sense of an earlier item. A lexical item may exactly repeat an earlier item. Indeed the most straightforward lexical cohesive tie is repetition. The category of repetition includes not

only identical words, but also ties between words of the same lexical root as well as words closely related though of a different root. With reference to Malay, this would refer to all words sharing the same root whatever their morphological alterations made possible by a rich and developed system of affixation. ✓

Alternatively, an item may be in a relation of synonymy or near-synonymy with an earlier item.

A third possibility is for a reference to an earlier item to be made in more general terms.

While grammatical cohesive devices like conjunction, reference, substitution and ellipsis are markers of textual relations, the various types of lexical reiteration are in the first place, types of lexical relation and secondarily markers of textual relation. This is especially true of collocation which has long been the name given to relationship a lexical item has with items that appear with greater than random probability in its (textual) context. (Martin Phillips, 1985; Michael Hoey, 1991 and Winter, E.O., 1977).

Reiteration and collocation are lexical relations, not in the first instance textual ones. In so far as they contribute to the creation and

organisation of text, the organisation is lexical. Lexical cohesion is the only type of cohesion that regularly forms multiple relationships. If this is taken into account, lexical cohesion becomes the dominant mode of creating texture. In other words, the study of the greater part of cohesion is the study of lexis, and the study of cohesion in text is to a considerable degree the study of patterns of lexis in text. (Hoey, 1991).

